



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

acterized the journey of his distinguished predecessor five years ago. Whatever grounds of complaint any of the South American countries may feel themselves justified in holding against us will not in the least, we are sure, interfere with the proper expression of the respect and honor due to the representative of our country on such a visit as this. We expect nothing but the best of results from Mr. Knox's journey in deepening the feelings of friendship and goodwill between these countries and our own. He will assure them, of course, that the Monroe Doctrine is not to be exercised in any way to interfere with their independence and rights, either political or commercial.

The diplomatic indiscretion of Minister Ospina will not, we think, interfere in any way with Mr. Knox's being warmly received at the capital of Colombia. This indiscretion has been reproved by the government of Colombia and Mr. Ospina recalled from his position as Minister to this country. We wish that Secretary Knox, when he arrives at the Colombian capital, might be able, under instructions from President Taft, to say to the Colombian government that we are now ready to arbitrate the question of indemnity due from our Government to Colombia because of the alleged violation by the United States of our former treaty with Colombia in connection with the setting up of the republic of Panama. However severely we may condemn the diplomatic imprudence of Minister Ospina, it is perfectly well known that there is a great deal of truth behind what he said. The general feeling in Colombia is strong against this country, because of what is there considered to have been a serious violation of the treaty above referred to. Arbitration of the question has frequently been urged upon us by the Colombian government, but has heretofore always been refused. If Secretary Knox would take this step and assure the Colombian authorities that we are ready to let this question of indemnity—for that is all the Colombian government has ever proposed—go to the Hague Court, more would be done toward relieving any feeling of fear of this country among the South American States than all of the speeches which the Secretary may make in all the capitals south of us. This question will have to be arbitrated some day. The moral sense of the nation will require it. Why not do it now?

The German Elections.

The growth of opposition in Germany to the devouring militarism of the nation, with its increasing burdens upon the masses, has been strikingly demonstrated by the results of the recent election for members of the Reichstag. The Socialists have nearly doubled their representation, having elected some 110 members of the new Parliament. These seats represent more than four

millions of voters, about one-third of the entire voting population of the empire, and constitute the Socialists the largest party group in the Reichstag. It is scarcely possible that any serious legislation can be carried through without their consent. The significance of this Socialist triumph—for such it is—for the peace movement lies in the fact that the Socialist party is in the closest affiliation and coöperation with their fellow Socialists in other countries. They are radically opposed to all those international policies of vituperation, nagging, and distrust which result in tension and war scares and promote the constant increase of armaments and war budgets, with the consequent progressive exhaustion of the people. They believe and practice, if we may use the word, solidarity among the peoples of different countries as well as among the citizens of their own country. Representatives of these German Socialists took part in the Copenhagen Conference in 1910, where the proposition was seriously discussed, and finally committed for study to the groups in the different countries, that in case of a declaration of war between two nations a general strike of all the workers in the government shops should be declared, in order to make the war impossible. The presence of so many of these men in the German Parliament is certain to have a powerful influence over the foreign policies of the government, to hasten the conclusion of such international conventions as will lessen the chances of war, and ultimately lead to reduction of armaments. This, we think, is a fair forecast of the influence for the peace of the world which the increase of the Socialist element in the German Parliament is sure to have.

Reduction of Armaments.

In his remarkable speech before the London City Liberal Club on Saturday, the 3d of February, the British Chancellor of the Exchequer, David Lloyd-George, is said by British papers distinctly to have foreshadowed some arrangement, or some attempt at an arrangement, among the powers for a reduction of armaments. The part of his speech devoted to this subject was received with the utmost enthusiasm by the great audience of Liberals, who filled every part of the hall. After defending his budget against the criticisms of the Opposition, he said:

"But if you want really to effect economy in finance—and we all do. Who is it that is rejoicing in increased expenditure? The governments do not—if you really want to effect an economy, you must arrest the growth of armaments. When the Unionist government came into power, in 1895, the aggregate cost of the army and navy—and that is now fifteen years ago—was 39 millions (sterling). When they left office, if you include what they called temporary borrowing (laughter)—but it was really expenditure for the year—it came to 70

millions, an increase of from 39 millions to 70 millions in ten years. We honestly thought that we could have put it back. The pressure of events has been too great, and this last year our expenditure for the army and navy has been 72 millions—a gigantic sum—a hideous sum—when you begin to reflect how much there is that has got to be done to relieve human misery in the land. Seventy-two millions! Are we at the end of it? (A voice: 'No.') Do not forget this. There are men applying great brains, working assiduously to devise new machinery of slaughter, and, however those machines may develop, they have all one common end in view, one common characteristic—that the newest is the costliest. It is but a short time ago when we shuddered at the thought that a single battleship cost one million, and they cost two millions now, and they are going to improve. (Laughter.) Let us here again face the facts. Until you remove national envies and jealousies and fears and suspicions you will never arrest the growth of armaments. That is the first thing to do, and I believe that this is the most advantageous moment—in spite of the many conditions which are adverse—to consider it.

"We are not alone in realizing the danger that may arise from the international atmosphere. In spite of all circumstances which we deprecate, recent events have had the effect of calling attention—calling the attention of all nations—to the perils of the position. I am not going back upon any past circumstances. I am not going to defend the government or criticise others. I am not going to defend myself for any part which I took. Why? Not because I should not be prepared to do so did I think it desirable, but because I am convinced that the more you go on justifying the more you will keep up the irritation. There is one very favorable circumstance. Morocco, which was a constant source of irritation and exasperation between the great powers, has been settled. There has been an agreement which has been to the mutual advantage of both France and Germany and which has not been injurious to British interests. And, after all, the morrow of a dispute is not always the worst time to make up a difference. I believe it is in the interests of France, Germany, Russia, and ourselves that there should be a better understanding between the nations. I believe that with candor and frankness—and boldness—(cheers)—it is attainable. The world would be better and richer for it. Taxes might be reduced, and all the money which would be saved from armaments could be devoted to developing the resources of the country and improving the condition of the people. Money spent upon education, upon housing, upon uplifting the lot of the people is a better and more assured investment than any which could be produced, and I, in conclusion, would like to say this one word: The corner-stone of sound finance is "peace on earth and good-will amongst men." (Loud cheers.)

The preliminary notices are out announcing that the Eighteenth Annual Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration will be held at Mohonk Lake, Ulster County, N. Y., May 15, 16, and 17. The Conference is expected to be the largest ever held at that famous spot.

Against Airships in War.

The following appeal to the governments of the world to enter into an agreement not to use airships in war has been issued in England, signed by many of the best-known people of the country:

"We appeal to all governments to foster by every means in their power an international understanding which shall preserve the world from what will add a new hideousness to the present hideousness of warfare.

"Without universal agreement no single power can stay its hand—every day of ingenuity and every pound of money spent diminishes the chance of such agreement.

"The occasion is unique. The civilized world is now alive to the ghastliness and economic waste of war; the Hague Conference is an established fact. For the first time, in the face of a new development of the arts of fighting, nations possess both the conscience and the machinery necessary to check that development effectually.

"All civilization protests its desire for peace and good-will; protests its wish to reduce the already grievous burden of armaments. Unless its protestations be those of a hopeless hypocrite, it cannot stand and watch the conquest of the air, that most glorious of men's mechanical achievements, callously turned to the usages of destruction; it cannot idly acquiesce in a new departure that must heavily increase this burden of armaments.

"There are many who believe that aerial warfare, by reason of its sheer horror, must prove a blessing in disguise, frightening men from war. To those we say: Civilization does not sanction the ravages of a new and arrestable form of disease, in order that men through horror may be more eager to join hands in stamping out all forms of sickness. And further, you underestimate the fortitude and adaptability of human nature, which has long proved that it can endure all forms of terror.

"There are some who insist that the art of flying will never reach full development without the stimulus of war. To such we suggest that the story of mankind does not leave us without hope that where there is demand, even when only for the purposes of peaceful life, there will also be supply. If the art of flying be delayed a few years by the resolve of men to use that art for mutual help, and not for mutual destruction, the world will be no loser.

"There are many who argue that because men fight on earth and water, they may just as well fight in the air. To these we answer: There has never yet been a moment when it was practically possible to ban the war machines of earth or water. There is a moment when it is practically possible to ban those of the air. That moment is now—before the use of these machines is proved; before great vested interests have formed.

Governments are trustees not only of the present, but of the future of mankind. Fortune has placed this moment in the hands of the governments of today. We pray of them to use it wisely."

This appeal comes none too soon. It ought to be followed by similar appeals in all other countries.